

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 2, 4 remain in the present application, claim 3 is deleted, and new claim 5 is added.

Reconsideration of this application and entry of the foregoing amendments are requested. Claims 1, 2 and 4 have been amended in view of the Office Action and to better define what the Applicants consider their invention, as fully supported by an enabling disclosure. Additional support for the amendments to claims 1, 2 and 4 can be found, for example, at paragraphs 0014 and 0015. Support for new claim 5 can be found, for example, at paragraphs 0014 to 0016.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,234,062 to Griffin. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection as follows.

Applicant amends claim 1 to more precisely recite what it believes the invention is, as supported in the description as filed.

Griffin discloses a piston assembly comprising an inner component 2, an intermediate component 3 and an outer component 6 in a housing 1, all telescopically intermitted together in an arrangement allowing a reduced size gas storage volume and/or a significant improvement in energy efficiency, by providing that a high gas pressure acts on a small area, followed by a lower pressure acting on a larger area (see column 3 lines 14-37).

Griffin is not concerned with a hoist formed of a series of telescopically arranged tubular sections that allows ambient air to freely enter in the hoist between a piston head and tubular

section thereof, made in a material allowing a semi-lubricated contact between each tubular section, as described in paragraph 0012. Griffin does not teach or even hint at a telescopic hoist as now recited in amended claim 1.

In view of the above and foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw his rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,983,778 to Dawson. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection as follows.

Applicant amends claims 2 and 4 to more precisely recite what it believes the invention is, as supported in the description as filed, and cancels claim 3.

Dawson discloses a telescopic hydraulic hoist mechanism made from rolled aluminum stock, which is lighter than available hoists and not subject to corrosion (see column 2 lines 48-58). Dawson teaches using breathers on each hydraulic stage (see column 3 lines 22-29) to prevent dirt from being sucked into the hydraulic mechanism (see column 1, lines 10-11). As people in the art will appreciate, and as mentioned in the background section of the present application at page 2, these breathers are very quickly filled which results in causing air to be pushed and aspirated through wipers installed on these piston heads, these wipers therefore being very rapidly damaged thereby leaving debris to contaminate the hoist.

Dawson does not hint at a telescopic hoist arrangement as now recited in claims 2 and 4.

In view of the above and foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw his rejection of claims 2 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The rejections of the original claims are believed to have been overcome by the present remarks, amendments and the introduction of a new claim. From the foregoing, further and favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance is believed to be next in order, and such an action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

LUC MAINVILLE (Applicant)

Dated: 09/23/2005

By: William K. Baxter
William K. Baxter
Reg. No. 41,606

Attorneys of Record for the Applicant
GODFREY & KAHN, S.C.
780 North Water Street
Milwaukee, WI 53202-3590
Telephone: 414-273-3500
Facsimile: 414-273-5198
Email: wbaxter@gklaw.com

MW1009702_1.DOC